



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,308	03/10/2004	Frederick D. Sancilio	046121-0106	9120
22428	7590	08/09/2007	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			LEWIS, AMY A	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW			1614	
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/796,308	SANCILIO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amy A. Lewis	1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-160 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) 1-160 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-58 and 160, drawn to an ion pair compound, classified in class 514, subclass 183, for example.
- II. Claims 59-151, drawn to a method of treating a condition for which is indicated an analgesic and/or an anti-inflammatory agent comprising administering the ion pair of claim 1, classified in class 514, subclass 183, for example.
- III. Claims 152-159, drawn to a process for preparing an ion pair compound comprising a narcotic and a cation, classified in class 514, subclass 183, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the composition of Invention II can be used in a materially different process, such as an *in vitro* assay for detecting solubility of the ion pair at various pH levels. Such an assay would not require the administration of the composition to a subject, as is required of the method of group II which would likely raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product produced by the

process of Invention III does not necessarily yield the product of Invention I; the process of Invention III does not require the use of an NSAID.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the method of using the product of Invention II is not necessarily made by the process of Invention III.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to maintain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain

Art Unit: 1614

dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the protection against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. § 804.01.

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species A. **Narcotics:** numerous, as in claims 2-9, 98, 123, and 148; elect ONE narcotic, whether group I, II, or III is elected.

Species B. **NSAIDs:** numerous, as in claims 10-19, 20-25, 92-97, 117-122, and 142-147; elect ONE NSAID, whether group I, II, or III is elected.

Optional Species C. **Additional NSAID:**

Instant claim 34, for example, requires an additional NSAID in the claimed composition, in contrast to instant claim 1 (which does not require an additional NSAID). If Group I is elected, Applicants are **firstly** required to elect from claim embodiments wherein there is

- C1) NO additional NSAID as in instant claims 1-33, for example, OR
- C2) claim embodiments which require an additional NSAID, as in instant claim 34.

If Applicants elect embodiment C2), then Applicants are required to specifically elect the ONE additional NSAID from those listed as NSAIDs, recited in claims 10-19, 20-25, 92-97, 117-122, and 142-147 for example.

Optional Species D. Dispersing agents:

Instant claim 46, for example, requires a dispersing agent in the claimed composition, in contrast to instant claim 1 (which does not require a dispersing agent). If Group I is elected, Applicants are **firstly** required to elect from claim embodiments wherein there is

- D1) NO dispersing agent required, as in instant claims 1-33, for example, OR
- D2) claim embodiments which require a dispersing agent, as in instant claim 46, for example.

If Applicants elect embodiment D2), then Applicants are required to specifically elect the **ONE** dispersing agent from those recited in claims 48 and 51, for example.

Optional Species E. Plasticizing agents:

Instant claim 46, for example, optionally requires a plasticizing agent in the claimed composition, in contrast to instant claim 1 (which does not require a plasticizing agent). If Group I is elected, Applicants are **firstly** required to elect from claim embodiments wherein there is

- E1) NO plasticizing agent required, as in instant claims 1-33, for example, OR
- E2) claim embodiments which require a plasticizing agent, as in instant claims 46 or 56, for example.

If Applicants elect embodiment D2), then Applicants are required to specifically elect the **ONE** plasticizing agent from those recited in claim 57, for example.

F. Conditions to be treated: numerous, as in claims 79-81, 83, 84, and 86; elect **ONE** condition if the invention of Group II is elected.

Claims 26-32, 43-45, 99-101, 124-126, and 149-151 will be examined to the extent that they read on the elected narcotic and the elected NSAID(s).

Claims 47, 49, and 50 will be examined to the extent they read on the elected dispersing agent.

Claims 59-61, 68-70, 77, 78, 82, 85, 87-91, 102, 103, 107, 110, 112-116, 127, 128, 132, 135, and 137-141 will be examined to the extent they read on the elected condition.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-160 are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without

traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy A. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-9032. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Amy A. Lewis

Ardin H. Marschel 8/5/07
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER